

ypw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,143	07/30/2001	Taejae Lee	STL920000098US1	3006

7590

12/21/2004

David W. Victor
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR LLP
Suite 210
315 S. Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/918,143

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-48 are pending in this application.
2. The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page, lines 5-16; The entire specification should be so revised).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending application No. 09,918,144 (Hereinafter referred to as Application'144) in view of U.S. Pat. 5,644,768 to Periwai et al.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claims teaches an application programming interface call

Art Unit: 2126

(API) to perform a workflow related operation, at least one stored procedure call associated with the received API, calling the determined at least one stored procedure to cause the execution of one stored procedure on a database server to perform the workflow related operation of the API.

The difference between the claims is the steps of receiving API call and determining the stored procedure associated with the API call.

Periwal teaches the steps of receiving API call and determining the stored procedure associated with the API call (Col. 10 Ln. 62 – 67, Col. 11 Ln. 1 – 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Periwal and Application'144 because the teaching of Periwal would improve the system of Application'144 by providing a means of determining when to prepare store procedure use (Col. 11 Ln. 1 – 6).

5. As to claim 2-48, they are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious double patenting for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2126

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,422 to Buzsaki in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,644,786 to Periwat et al.

8. As to claim 1, Hills teaches a method for performing workflow related operations, comprising: receiving an application programming interface call (API) to perform a workflow related operation (“...invokes...” Col. 5 Ln. 21 -30), and calling the determined at least one stored procedure to cause the execution of one determined stored procedure on a database server to perform the workflow related operation of the API (“...program code stored...” Col. 5 Ln. 26 – 30).

9. Hills does not explicitly describe determining at least one stored procedure call associated with the received API.

Periwat teaches determining at least one stored procedure call associated with the received API (Col. 10 Ln. 62 – 67, Col. 11 Ln. 1 – 6).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Periwat and Hills because the teaching of Periwat would improve the system of Hills by providing a means of determining or selecting the appropriate stored procedure to use for a given call (Periwat Col. 10 Ln. 62 – 67).

Art Unit: 2126

11. As to claim 2, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 1, wherein at least one stored procedure call invokes one stored procedure in the database server that includes native workflow server code to communicate to a workflow server to execute to perform the workflow related operation of the API and wherein at least one stored procedure call invokes one stored procedure in the database server that includes database statements executed by a database program to access workflow related metadata for the API (Col. 5 Ln. 31 – 55).

12. As to claim 3, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the workflow related operation for at least one API is to be performed on a workflow server and wherein the workflow related operation for at least one API is to access workflow metadata from a workflow database (Col. 6 Ln. 12 – 30).

13. As to claim 4, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the workflow related operation comprises a function to perform on a workflow server, wherein the database server includes a database program that executes one determined stored procedure to perform: communicating native workflow server code included in the executed stored procedure to the workflow server, wherein the workflow server executes the native workflow server code to perform the workflow related operation of the API (Col. 5 Ln. 31 – 55).

Art Unit: 2126

14. As to claim 5, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the API and the native workflow server code are in different programming language (Col. 6 Ln. 52 – 67).

15. As to claim 6, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the workflow related operation concerns accessing workflow metadata in a workflow database, wherein the database server includes a database program that executes one determined stored procedure to perform: executing database statements included in the executed stored procedure to access workflow metadata in the workflow database (Col. 6 Ln. 12 – 30).

16. As to claim 7, Buzsaki teaches the method claim 3, wherein the database statements comprise Structured Query Language (SQL) statements (Col. 6 Ln. 65 – 67).

17. As to claims 8,17,24,33 and 40, see the rejection of claim 1.

18. As to claim 9, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the received at least one call to one stored procedure comprises a first and second stored procedure calls to first and second stored procedures, respectively, on the database server to implement the workflow related operation of the API (Col. 6 Ln. 12 – 45).

Art Unit: 2126

19. As to claim 10, Buszaki teaches the method of claim 9, wherein executing the first stored procedure comprises authenticating the client and establishing a connection and wherein executing the second received stored procedure call comprises performing the workflow related operation of the API (Col. 6 Ln. 12 – 45).

20. As to claim 11, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 9, wherein executing the first stored procedure comprises accessing workflow metadata from a workflow database, and wherein executing the second stored procedure comprises communicating native workflow server code and the accessed workflow metadata to a workflow server, wherein the workflow server processes the communicated native workflow server code and the workflow metadata to perform the workflow related operation of the API (Col. 5 Ln. 31 – 51).

21. As to claim 12, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 9, wherein executing the first stored procedure comprises communicating native workflow server code to a workflow server, wherein the workflow server processes the communicated native workflow server code to perform the workflow related operation of the API and returns workflow metadata, and wherein executing the second stored procedure call for the API comprises updates a workflow database with the workflow metadata returned by the workflow server (Col. 5 Ln. 47 – 61).

22. As to claim 13, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the received call to the stored procedure comprises a first call to a first stored procedure associated with a first API (request), wherein the first stored procedure includes database statements, wherein executing the first stored procedure comprises communicating the database statements to a database program to access workflow metadata from a workflow database, further comprising: receiving a second stored procedure call associated with a second API that invokes a second stored procedure on the database server (figure 2 Col. 6 Ln. 12 – 45), wherein the second stored procedure includes native workflow server code (Col. 6 Ln. 53 – 67); and executing the second stored procedure to communicate the native workflow server code and the accessed workflow metadata included therein to a workflow server to process to perform the workflow related operation associated with the second API (request) (Col. 5 Ln. 31 – 51).

23. As to claim 14, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the first stored procedure returns the accessed workflow metadata to the client, and wherein the second stored procedure call from the client passes the accessed workflow metadata to the second stored procedure to communicate to the workflow server with the native workflow server code (Message Table 600 Col. 30 – 45).

24. As to claim 15, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the received call to the stored procedure comprises a first call to a first stored procedure associated with

Art Unit: 2126

a first API, wherein the first stored procedure includes native workflow server code, wherein executing the first stored procedure comprises communicating the native workflow server code to a workflow server to process and perform the workflow related operation associated with the first API, wherein the workflow server returns workflow metadata, further comprising: receiving a second stored procedure call associated with a second API that invokes a second stored procedure on the database server, wherein the second stored procedure includes database statements; and executing the second stored procedure to cause a database program to execute the database statements to update a workflow database with the returned workflow metadata (Message Table 600 Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 45).

25. As to claim 16, Buzsaki teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the first stored procedure returns the returns workflow metadata from the workflow server to the client, and wherein the second stored procedure call from the client passes the returned workflow metadata from the workflow server to the second stored procedure to call the database program to update the workflow database with the returned workflow metadata (Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 45).

26. As to claim 18, Buzsaki teaches the system of claim 17, wherein at least one stored procedure call invokes one stored procedure that includes native workflow server code to perform the workflow related operation of the API (fig 2 Col. 5 Ln. 11 – 51), while Hills teaches at least one stored procedure call invokes one stored procedure that

Art Unit: 2126

includes database statements to access workflow related metadata for the AP1, further comprising: a workflow server/ a database (fig 2), means, performed by the workflow server, for receiving native workflow server code from one stored procedure/ means, performed by the workflow server, for executing the received native workflow server code to perform the workflow related operation (Buzsaki Col. 5 Ln. 11 – 51), and means for executing database statements from one stored procedure to access workflow related metadata for the API from the database (Hills Col. 6 Ln. 35 – 55).

27. As to claim 19, Buzsaki teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the workflow related operation for at least one API is to be performed on a workflow server and wherein the workflow related operation for at least one API is to access workflow metadata from a workflow database (Col. 5 Ln. 31 – 51).

28. As to claim 20, Buzsaki teaches the system of claim 17, further comprising: a workflow server, wherein the workflow related operation comprises a function to perform on the workflow server; means, performed at the database server, for executing one determined stored procedure to communicate native workflow server code included in the executed stored procedure to the workflow server; and means, performed by the workflow server, for executing the native workflow server code to perform the workflow related operation of the API (fig 8 Col. 5 Ln. 31 – 51, Col. 10 Ln. 27 – 67).

29. As to claims 21-23, see the rejection of claims 5-7 respectively.

30. As to claims 25,41 and 26,42, see the rejection of claims 9 and 10 respectively.

31. As to claims 27- 30 and 32, see the rejection of claims 11-14 and 16 respectively.

32. As to claim 31, Buzsaki teaches the system of claim 25, wherein the received call to the stored procedure comprises a first call to a first stored procedure associated with a first API, wherein the first stored procedure includes native workflow server code, further comprising: a workflow server, wherein the means for executing the at least one stored procedure performs executing the first stored procedure to communicate the native workflow server code in the first stored procedure to the workflow server to process and perform the workflow related operation associated with the first API; means for returning, performed by the workflow server, workflow metadata, wherein the means for executing the at least one stored procedure further performs receiving the second stored procedure call associated with a second API that invokes the second stored procedure on the database server, wherein the second stored procedure includes database statements; a workflow database; and executing, at the database server, the database statements in the second stored procedure to update the workflow database with the returned workflow metadata (Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 45).

33. As to claims, 34,36,37and 39, see the rejection of claims 2,4,5 and 7 respectively.

34. As to claims 35 and 38, see the rejection of claims 3 and 6 respectively.
35. As to claims 43-46 and 48, see the rejection of claims 11-14 and 16 respectively.
36. As to claim 47, see the rejection of claim 15 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


MENG-AI AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100